arXiv:1411.3827v2 [math.CT] 20 Nov 2014

AUTONOMIZATION OF MONOIDAL CATEGORIES

ANTONIN DELPEUCH

Abstract. We define the free autonomous category generated by a monoidal category and study some of its properties. From a linguistic perspective, this expands the range of possible models of meaning within the distributional compositional framework, by allowing nonlinearities in maps. From a categorical point of view, this provides a factorization of the construction in [Preller and Lambek, 2007] of the free autonomous category generated by a category.

1. Introduction

Category theory has recently been applied to linguistics, and suggests an elegant approach to compositional models of meaning. This approach is based on pregroup grammars, where words are given algebraic types encoding their grammatical role, and where the structure of a grammatical sentence is represented by a type reduction. Viewing the types as objects in a category and the reductions as arrows between them enables us to study the reductions themselves, which can then be translated to functions composing the meaning of individual words into the meaning of a sentence [Preller, 2005, Clark, 2008, Coecke et al., 2010], as we will see in Section 4.

Pregroups are modelled by autonomous[1] categories, i.e. monoidal categories where every object has left and right adjoints. This induces a constraint on the semantics: our model of meaning needs to be embeddable in an autonomous category. A popular example of such a model is the category **Vect** of vector spaces and linear maps, equipped with a monoidal structure given by the tensor product [Coecke et al., 2013, Clark, 2013, Grefenstette et al., 2014]. The properties of this category are discussed in Section 5.

The requirement to satisfy this autonomous structure constrains our search for new models of meaning. As a consequence, researchers have been tempted to perform ad hoc changes to the categorical model, loosing the tools it provides, such as the use of string diagrams to reason about the morphisms.

In this paper, we show how any monoidal category freely generates an autonomous category. This expands the range of models of meaning that can be used to any monoidal category, and not just any autonomous category. Some interesting candidates for alternative semantics are sketched in Section 5.

Our technique to build the free autonomous category consists in using string diagrams as the arrows themselves. To do so, we use the results of [Joyal and Street, 1988, Joyal and

Key words and phrases: monoidal, autonomous, compact closed, diagrams, linguistics, semantics, pregroup.

© Antonin Delpeuch, 2014. Permission to copy for private use granted.

[1]These categories are sometimes called *compact closed*, but in this paper we stick to the terminology of [Selinger, 2011] as it is important to note that our autonomous categories are not symmetric.

Street, 1991], who have defined the string diagrams associated to autonomous categories, and have proved their coherence. In Section 6, we add an equivalence relation to identify some of these diagrams, ensuring that the original category can be embedded functorialy in the free autonomous category it generates. This enables us to prove the adjunction between our free functor and its forgetful counterpart in Section 7.

2. Terminology

We recall some basic notions of category theory.

2.1. Definition. *A **strict monoidal category** $\mathcal{C}$ is a category equipped with a bifunctor $_ \otimes _ : \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}$, with an object $I \in \mathcal{C}$ such that*

- *$I \otimes _ : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}$ and $_ \otimes I : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}$ are the identity functor.*
- *$\otimes$ is associative on objects and arrows.*

The product $\otimes$ being a functor, for any arrows f_1, f_2, g_1, g_2 such that the $f_1 \circ f_2$ and $g_1 \circ g_2$ are defined, the following equality (called the bifunctoriality equation) holds:

$$(f_1 \otimes g_1) \circ (f_2 \otimes g_2) = (f_1 \circ f_2) \otimes (g_1 \circ g_2) \tag{1}$$

This equation is the starting point of the graphical languages introduced in [Joyal and Street, 1991], as we will see in the next section. In what follows, monoidal categories are always strict.

2.2. Definition. *Given two monoidal categories $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$, a functor $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$ is **strong monoidal** when there is a family of natural isomorphisms $\mu_{X,Y} : F(X \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} Y) \to F(X) \otimes_{\mathcal{D}} F(Y)$ and an isomorphism $\lambda : F(I_{\mathcal{C}}) \to I_{\mathcal{D}}$ satisfying some associativity and unitality conditions.*

See [Mac Lane, 1998] for the details of the associativity and unitality conditions. A strict monoidal functor is a strong monoidal functor where the coherence natural transformations are the identity. We will mostly use strong monoidal functors, because it is often useful to keep the monoidal structure of the two categories distinct.

2.3. Definition. *In a monoidal category, an object A is a **left adjoint** of B (and B is a **right adjoint** of A) when there are two morphisms $\epsilon : A \otimes B \to I$ and $\eta : I \to B \otimes A$ such that*

$$(1_B \otimes \epsilon) \circ (\eta \otimes 1_B) = 1_B \qquad \text{and} \qquad (\epsilon \otimes 1_A) \circ (1_A \otimes \eta) = 1_A \tag{2}$$

2.4. Proposition. *The left (respectively right) adjoint of an object is unique up to isomorphism.*

Proof. Given (A, ϵ, η), (A', ϵ', η') left adjoints of B, one can check that $f = (\epsilon \otimes 1_{A'}) \circ (1_A \otimes \eta') : A \to A'$ is an isomorphism, with inverse $(\epsilon' \otimes 1_A) \circ (1_{A'} \otimes \eta)$. The proof of the uniqueness of the right adjoint is symmetric. ∎

2.5. Definition. *A monoidal category is* ***autonomous*** *when every object has a left and right adjoint, denoted respectively by A^l and A^r.*

2.6. Proposition. *For every object A in an autonomous category, $A^{rl} \simeq A^{lr} \simeq A$*

Proof. A and A^{rl} are both left adjoints of A^r so they are isomorphic by Proposition 2.4, and similarly for A and A^{lr}. ∎

We define by induction $A^{(0)} = A$ and $A^{(n+1)} = (A^{(n)})^r$. Similarly, $A^{(-(n+1))} := (A^{(-n)})^l$. As a consequence of Proposition 2.6, $(A^{(p)})^{(q)} \simeq A^{(p+q)} \simeq (A^{(q)})^{(p)}$ for every $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}$.

We could extend the definition of strong monoidal functor to autonomous categories, requiring that it also preserves the autonomous structure. In fact, this is not necessary because if A is a left adjoint of B in $\mathcal{C}$ and F is a strong monoidal functor to $\mathcal{D}$, then $F(A)$ is a left adjoint of $F(B)$, as shown in [Joyal and Street, 1993].

3. Diagrammatic languages

The bifunctoriality equation basically states the compatibility between vertical (sequential) and horizontal (compound) compositions, but is not very intuitive when stated in the form of (1). It is simpler to make use of a diagrammatic representation for arrows. An arrow $f : A \to B$ is represented by the following diagram on the left:



In the case where the domain (respectively the codomain) is the monoidal unit I, we depict f as a box without input (respectively without output) and give it a triangular shape, motivated by an analogy with the Dirac notation [Coecke, 2009]. The diagrams for composite arrows are defined as follows:



With these conventions, the bifunctoriality equation (1) takes a very simple form:



As $\circ$ and $\otimes$ are also associative, this implies that we can drop the brackets in diagrams. One consequence of this identity is the following equality:



This is our first example of how an equality translates into a topological equivalence on the diagrams. This observation has been used to prove in [Joyal and Street, 1988, Joyal and Street, 1991] the following theorem of coherence for (planar) monoidal categories:

3.1. THEOREM. [as stated in [Selinger, 2011], 3.1] *A well-formed equation between morphisms terms in the language of monoidal categories follows from the axioms of monoidal categories if and only if it holds, up to planar isotopy, in the graphical language.*

For autonomous categories, we use the following diagrammatic representations for the adjunctions:

The yanking equations (2) become

This is again a topological equivalence, leading to the following theorem of coherence for (planar) autonomous categories:

3.2. THEOREM. [as stated in [Selinger, 2011], 4.5] *A well-formed equation between morphisms in the language of autonomous categories follows from the axioms of autonomous categories if and only if it holds in the graphical language up to planar isotopy.*

This theorem has been proved in [Joyal and Street, 1988] but for piecewise linear diagrams only, for technical reasons.

4. Syntax and semantics with categories

Autonomous categories are useful in type-theoretical approaches to linguistics, more precisely those based on pregroup grammars. We give here a very short introduction to these grammars and refer the interested reader to [Coecke et al., 2013] for a more detailed description of the framework.

In such a pregroup grammar, each word w_i is given a type t_i, object in an autonomous category. This type encodes the semantic and grammatical role of the word. A sentence $w_1, \ldots, w_n$ is considered grammatical when the product of the types $t_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes t_n$ *reduces* to the type of a sentence, which is a particular object s in the category. More precisely, a grammatical reduction consists in an arrow $f : t_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes t_n \to s$ obtained by horizontal and vertical composition of counits and identities.

In a categorical setting, the product of the types is the tensor product of the autonomous category, and the type reduction is an arrow from the product of the types to the type of a sentence, s.



Once we have an arrow for our sentence, we can compose it with the semantic representation of the words to get the semantic representation of the sentence. Depending on the concrete nature of the category involved, this can be used to combine truth-theoretic values and represent the sentence as a first-order formula [Preller, 2012], or to integrate distributional representations obtained from word co-occurrences in a dataset [Grefenstette and Sadrzadeh, 2011].

5. Monoidal categories and models of meaning

Giving a model of meaning to a pregroup grammar consists in choosing an autonomous category in which both the representations of the words and the type reductions will be embodied. There are roughly two families of such models. The first is consists in giving logical semantics *à la* Montague, by translating nouns to abstract entities, adjectives to predicates on these entities, verbs to relations and sentences to logical formulas. This approach has been applied to pregroups in [Preller, 2005, Preller, 2012, Delpeuch and Preller, 2014]. The second consists in representing words by real-valued vectors representing the typical context in which the words are encountered in a large corpus. It has been applied to pregroups in [Clark, 2008, Grefenstette et al., 2014, Sadrzadeh et al., 2014] and many others. We will focus on this latter setting, where most applications of categorical linguistics are concentrated. The next sections explore the categories that can be used for this type of model of meaning.

5.1. Linear maps and the tensor product The most popular semantic category for distributional models is the autonomous category of finite-dimensional vector spaces and linear maps between them, denoted by **Vect**, with the tensor product $\otimes$ as monoidal operation (if not the only one, to our knowledge). This tradition has been initiated in the early works of [Clark and Pulman, 2007, Clark, 2008, Coecke et al., 2010] but we will argue that it has after all little legitimacy. The reasons for this choice were threefold.

First, the tensor product was motivated in [Clark and Pulman, 2007] by the use of this operation in the connectionist approach to cognitive science. The interesting feature of tensors was that they could account for correlations between the meanings of some words, as observed in the so-called *pet fish* problem (ibid.). However, the use of tensors induces a constraint on the composition of words: the arrows in **Vect** are *linear* maps, while many other successful composition methods use nonlinearities to model these correlations.

Second, it was necessary to use an autonomous category to model the type reduction as a repeated application of counits, and the category of vector spaces with the tensor product is probably the most natural category (in an informal sense) involving vector spaces and being autonomous. Moreover, it is also used in quantum physics (since [Abramsky and Coecke, 2004]) and has hence been extensively studied.

Third, researchers have argued (for instance in [Coecke et al., 2010, Clark, 2013]) that the objects assigned to words should be *entangled* in the sense of quantum physics. More precisely, we do not expect the element assigned to a word type $t_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes t_n$ to factor into a product of elements $x_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes x_n$, where $x_i : I \to t_i$. If it were the case, this would break the *flow of information* and the meaning of a sentence would be mostly independent from that of its constituents. For some simple models however, it seems that this entanglement is not essential, as reported in [Kartsaklis and Sadrzadeh, 2014]. Moreover, the price to pay for this entanglement is the high dimension of the vectors, as it grows exponentially with the number of basic types.

The second and the third requirement are actually linked: having entanglement is a prerequisite to an autonomous structure, as shown later in Proposition 5.4. We will show

that they can be satisfied in other categories than **Vect**.

5.2. Affine maps and the direct sum The requirement to use only linear maps induced by the category **Vect** restricts our understanding of the structure of the word vectors. For instance, the vectors computed in [Mikolov et al., 2014] have an interesting additive structure: they report that $\overrightarrow{King} - \overrightarrow{Man} + \overrightarrow{Woman}$ gives a vector whose nearest neighbour is $\overrightarrow{Queen}$. This structure should not be ignored by the composition model, but it is impossible if our arrows are simply linear maps: we would need affine maps.

One could try to generalize the category **Vect** to affine maps. But by doing so we would break the bifunctoriality equation required by the monoidal structure based on the tensor product. However, **Vect** has another monoidal structure, given by the direct sum, denoted by $\oplus$. And we can generalize it to affine maps.

5.3. Proposition. *The category of vector spaces and affine maps between them (denoted by* **Aff***) is a monoidal category when equipped with $\oplus$ as a monoid law and O (the vector space of dimension 0) as unit.*

Proof. We give a proof of the bifunctoriality equation, all other properties being routine checks. Let f, g, h, k be affine functions with the appropriate domains and codomains so that $(g \circ f) \oplus (h \circ k)$ is defined. Recall that an affine function p can be decomposed into a linear map and a constant: $p = \overrightarrow{p} + p(0)$.

$g \circ f = \overrightarrow{g} \circ \overrightarrow{f} + g(f(0)) + g(0)$, hence

$$\begin{aligned}(g \circ f) \oplus (h \circ k) &= (\overrightarrow{g} \circ \overrightarrow{f}) \oplus (\overrightarrow{h} \circ \overrightarrow{k}) + (g(f(0)) + g(0)) \oplus (h(k(0)) + h(0)) \\ &= (\overrightarrow{g} \oplus \overrightarrow{h} + g(0) \oplus h(0)) \circ (\overrightarrow{f} \oplus \overrightarrow{k} + f(0) \oplus k(0)) \\ &= (g \oplus h) \circ (f \oplus k)\end{aligned}$$

■

So $\oplus$ has the advantage over $\otimes$ to allow for affine maps. Besides, this monoidal structure keeps the dimension of the vector spaces small: $\dim A \oplus B = \dim A + \dim B$ whereas $\dim A \otimes B = \dim A \cdot \dim B$. When it comes to the concrete estimation of models of meaning, this property is essential.

In fact, $\oplus$ is even a biproduct and hence not autonomous, as the following property shows.

5.4. Proposition. *In a cartesian monoidal category, no object $A \neq O$ has a (right) adjoint (relative to the cartesian monoidal structure).*

Proof. We denote by $\oplus$ the cartesian product and O the terminal object associated to it. Let A and B be objects, different from O, $\epsilon : A \oplus B \to O$ and $\eta : O \to B \oplus A$. As the category is cartesian, there are some $u : O \to B$ and $v : O \to A$ such that $\eta = u \oplus v$. We get

$$(\epsilon \oplus 1_A) \circ (1_A \oplus \eta) = (\epsilon \oplus 1_A) \circ (1_A \oplus u \oplus v) = (\epsilon \circ (1_A \oplus u)) \oplus (1_A \circ v) = 0_A \oplus v$$

As $A \neq O$, there is $v' : O \to A$ such that $v' \neq v$. Now $(0_A \oplus v) \circ v' = (0_A \circ v') \oplus v = 1_O \oplus v = v$ hence $0_A \oplus v \neq 1_A$. In pictures:



■

This means that we cannot directly use this category as a model of meaning, firstly because the grammatical reduction cannot be represented as an arrow, and secondly because the meaning of the words would not be entangled. Our construction in Section 6 shows how to convert any monoidal category, hence in particular **Aff**, to an autonomous category. This will allow for a model of meaning with affine maps and entangled elements. This will recast approaches such as the **2Mat** model of [Polajnar et al., 2014] in the categorical framework.

5.5. Neural networks and the cartesian product If all we need is a monoidal category, we can go further by allowing nonlinearities, which leads us to neural models of meaning. This step has already been taken in [Krishnamurthy and Mitchell, 2013] where it has been applied to Combinatory Categorial Grammars. Our construction in Section 6 will enable a categorical treatment of this model.

Neural networks are functions obtained by the composition of linear maps and a special non-linear function called the activation function. We fix such a function $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$. It is generally required to be continuous, non-constant and bounded. The *neuron* is the basic block of these networks: it applies the nonlinear function to an affine combination of its inputs: $p : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \coloneqq \sigma \circ f$ where f is affine and σ is the activation function. How this basic block can be combined to make more complex networks is conveniently described by a monoidal category.

5.6. Definition. *Let C be the monoidal category (for $\oplus$ and O) of affine spaces over $\mathbb{R}$ and continuous maps between them. The category $\mathbf{Net}_\sigma$ is the monoidal subcategory of C generated by the affine maps and the activation function σ.*

Neural networks are generally thought of as a series of layers, each layer consisting in the parallel juxtaposition of neurons, and all the layers being sequentially composed. The following figure compares the classical representation of a neural network to its string diagram in **Net**. We have chosen not to add nonlinearities in the output layer, but it is of course possible to do so.



(a) An arrow in $\mathbf{Net}_\sigma$.
f and g are affine maps.



(b) Its traditional representation as a neural network

The class of neural networks with one hidden layer can approximate any continuous function, with respect to the uniform norm on a compact set. This result has been obtained first by [Cybenko, 1989] for the case where σ is the sigmoid, a popular choice of activation function ($\sigma(x) = \frac{1}{1+e^{-x}}$) and has been generalized to any non-constant, continuous and bounded function by [Hornik, 1991].

Again, $\mathbf{Net}_\sigma$ is cartesian, so it is not autonomous for this monoidal structure.

6. Constructing autonomous categories

6.1. Idea of the construction Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a strict monoidal category. Our goal is to embed $\mathcal{C}$ in a "larger" category, $L(\mathcal{C})$, which will be autonomous. The embedding has to be functorial, so that the original composition operations are retained.

The ϵ and η maps will be purely formal, which means that they will have no interpretation in the original category. Our approach to define them consists in taking diagrams seriously: the arrows of our autonomous category will be diagrams. To do so, we adapt the definitions of [Joyal and Street, 1988], who defined the diagrams for autonomous categories and proved their soundness and completeness. They assume for simplicity that the links in the diagrams are piecewise linear and we follow their choice.

Our construction is similar to that of [Preller and Lambek, 2007] who defined the autonomous category freely generated by a category $\mathcal{C}$, not assumed to be monoidal. Taking into account the monoidal structure of $\mathcal{C}$ construction is important for the linguistic applications mentioned in Section 5, as we need some compatibility between the initial monoidal structure in $\mathcal{C}$ and the monoidal structure of the larger category $L(\mathcal{C})$.

6.2. Graphs In this section, we summarize the definitions from [Joyal and Street, 1988] needed to define our category $L(\mathcal{C})$. Our goal is not to give the most general definition of topological graphs, but only to define precisely the objects that we will manipulate.

A **graph** Γ is a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^2$ together with a subset $\Gamma_0 \subseteq \Gamma$ such that

(i) Γ_0 is discrete and finite, its elements are called **nodes**;

(ii) $\Gamma - \Gamma_0$ has a finite number of connected components called **1-cells** and each of them is homeomorphic to an open interval.

We denote by $[p;q]$ the segment connecting two points $p, q \in \mathbb{R}^2$. For all tuples of points $t = (p_0, \ldots, p_n)$ we define $[p_0, \ldots, p_n] = [p_0, p_1] \cup [p_1, p_2] \cup \cdots \cup [p_{n-1}, p_n]$. The latter is called a **piecewise linear segment**. The tuple t is called **reduced** when there is no $0 < i < n$ such that $p_i \in [p_{i-1}, p_{i+1}]$. In this case, the p_i for $0 < i < n$ are called **singular points**. A parametrization of a reduced piecewise linear segment $\gamma : [0;1] \to [p_0, \ldots, p_n]$ such that $\gamma(0) = p_0$ and $\gamma(1) = p_n$ is called a **piecewise linear curve**. The **initial** (respectively **terminal**) segment of such a γ is $[p_0, p_1]$ (respectively $[p_{n-1}, p_n]$). We denote by $\overline{\gamma}$ the reversed parametrization: $\overline{\gamma}(t) = \gamma(1-t)$.

A **piecewise linear graph** Γ is a graph where the closure of any 1-cell is a piecewise linear segment, and such that no initial or terminal segment is horizontal. The **edges** of such a graph are the parametrizations of these closures, identified up to monotonous reparametrization (hence a 1-cell gives rise to two edges, γ and $\overline{\gamma}$). The set of edges is denoted by $\mathrm{Edges}(\Gamma)$. In the rest of this paper, all graphs are assumed to be piecewise linear.

Let γ be an edge and $x < y \in [0;1]$ be preimages of consecutive singular points of $\gamma([0;1])$. The segment $[\gamma(x), \gamma(y)]$ is **directed top** (respectively **bottom**) when the second coordinate of $\gamma(y)$ is greater (respectively smaller) than that of $\gamma(x)$. The last requirement of the definition of a piecewise linear graph implies that initial and terminal segments of edges are either directed top or bottom. This allows us to define the **inputs** of a node x as the set of edges γ such that $\gamma(1) = x$ and the terminal segment of γ is directed bottom. Similarly, the **outputs** of x are the edges γ such that $\gamma(0) = x$ and the initial segment of γ is directed bottom.

A graph Γ is **between slices** a and b, where $a < b$ are reals, when $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R} \times [a;b]$, and such that every node in $\mathbb{R} \times \{a\}$ (respectively b) has one input and no output (respectively one output and no input). These nodes included in $\mathbb{R} \times \{a, b\}$ are called **outer nodes** and the others are **inner nodes**. The set of inner nodes of a graph Γ is denoted by $\mathrm{Nodes}(\Gamma)$. The reason for this notation is that the outer nodes will not represent morphisms but simply "gates", i.e. inputs and outputs of the diagram. The outer nodes included in $\mathbb{R} \times \{a\}$ are called **lower outer nodes** and the other outer nodes are called **upper outer nodes**. A **regular slice** is a $c \in [a, b]$ such that $\Gamma_0 \cap \mathbb{R} \times \{c\} = \emptyset$. A **unit graph** is a graph included in $[0, 1]^2$ and between slices 0 and 1.

Finally, we need to define the turning number $\rho(\gamma)$ of an edge γ. Informally, this is the number of half-turns of the edge in the direct orientation, minus the number of half-turns in the indirect orientation. We invite the interested reader to consult [Joyal and Street, 1988] for a rigorous definition. The following examples should be enough to grasp the idea:



6.3. Definition. *A **yankable graph** is a graph between slices a and b such that for every edge γ between two inner nodes, $\rho(\gamma) = 0$.*

The reason for this additional requirement $\rho(\gamma) = 0$ is that we will attribute a morphism of $\mathcal{C}$ to each node in Section 6.5. Informally, as the domain and the codomain of such morphisms cannot contain *adjoints*, it is necessary that the links between them can be *yanked* to a straight line.

Here are a few examples of yankable and not yankable graphs. The edges that make the graphs not yankable are drawn with dotted lines.



A **deformation of graphs** Γ to Γ' is a regular deformation of polarised graphs between Γ and Γ', as defined in [Joyal and Street, 1988]. As it preserves the turning number of edges, it preserves yankable graphs.

6.4. Occurrences and replacement We define what an occurrence of a graph G_1 in a graph Γ is, and what the substitution of G^1 by G^2 in Γ is. This will be useful to define an equivalence relation on graphs, which will be required to define the autonomous category $L(\mathcal{C})$ properly.

This notion is not needed to obtain the soundness and correctness results of [Joyal and Street, 1988], so one could wonder why we introduce it while dealing with the same objects. The reason is that the autonomous category we are constructing cannot be completely free, as we have to retain the equalities holding in the original monoidal category. This will enable us to define a functorial embedding in Section 7.1.

Let $t = (a, b, c, d)$ with $a < b$ and $c < d$ be reals. We define an homeomorphism $\phi_t : [0, 1]^2 \to [a, b] \times [c, d]$ by $\phi_t(x, y) = (a + x(b - a), c + y(d - c))$. Let G^1 and G^2 be unit graphs, such that the outer nodes of G^1 and G^2 are the same. An **occurrence** of G^1 in a graph $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a quadruplet of reals $t = (a, b, c, d)$, $a < b$ and $c < d$, such that $\phi_t(G^1) = \Gamma \cap ([a, b] \times [c, d])$, and such that no node of Γ is included in the boundary of $[a, b] \times [c, d]$. We define $\Gamma[G^1 := G^2]_t = (\Gamma - \phi_t(G^1)) \cup \phi_t(G^2)$, with nodes $(\Gamma_0 - \phi_t(G^1_0)) \cup \phi_t(G^2_0)$.



One can check that $\Gamma[G_1 \coloneqq G_2]_t$ is a piecewise linear graph. However, it is not yankable in general. We will get this guarantee with the notion of valued graphs introduced in the next section.

6.5. VALUED GRAPHS In this section, we add *valuations* to the objects introduced in the previous section. This consists in labelling the nodes and the edges with objects and arrows from a category, in a consistent way.

6.6. DEFINITION. *A* ***$\mathcal{C}$-valued graph*** *is a yankable graph Γ with functions*

$$v_0 : \mathrm{Nodes}(\Gamma) \to \mathrm{Mor}(\mathcal{C}) \qquad\qquad v_1 : \mathrm{Edges}(\Gamma) \to \mathrm{Ob}(\mathcal{C}) \times \mathbb{Z}$$

such that:

(i) $\forall \gamma \in \mathrm{Edges}(\Gamma), v_1(\overline{\gamma}) = (A, n + \rho(\gamma))$ *where* $(A, n) = v_1(\gamma)$

(ii) $\forall x \in \mathrm{Nodes}(\Gamma), \forall \gamma \in \mathrm{Edges}(\Gamma)$

- *if* $\gamma(0) = x$ *then* $v_1(\gamma) = (A, 0)$ *for some* $A \in \mathrm{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$
- *if* $\gamma(1) = x$ *then* $v_1(\overline{\gamma}) = (A, 0)$ *for some* $A \in \mathrm{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$

(iii) $\forall x \in \mathrm{Nodes}(\Gamma), v_0(x) : v_1(\overline{\gamma_1}) \otimes \cdots \otimes v_1(\overline{\gamma_p}) \to v_1(\delta_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes v_1(\delta_q)$
where $\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_p$ and $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_q$ are the ordered lists of the input and output edges of x, and where $v_1^e(\gamma) = (A, 0)$ is identified with A for simplicity.

Informally, the value $v_1(\gamma)$ represents the domain of the edge γ, and $v_1(\overline{\gamma})$ represents its codomain. The condition (i) states the relation between the two. Note that a valued graph is always yankable, as the rotation number of an edge between two inner nodes is 0 because of the requirements (i) and (ii).

The valuation of an upper outer node x is $v_1(\gamma)$ where γ is the only edge such that $\gamma(0) = x$. Similarly, the valuation of a lower outer node x is $v_1(\overline{\gamma})$ where γ is the only edge such that $\gamma(1) = x$. In both cases, we denote this valuation by $v_b(x)$. The **domain** of a valued graph is the tuple $(v_b(x_1), \ldots, v_b(x_p))$ where x_i is the i-th upper outer node of the graph. The **codomain** is defined similarly with the lower outer nodes.

We can define the replacement of the valued graphs G^1 by G^2 in the valued graph Γ, when the domains and codomains of G^1 and G^2 are the same and the valuations of the nodes of G^1 and Γ agree.

6.7. LEMMA. *Let Γ be a valued graph and G^1, G^2 be valued unit graphs. Suppose that t is an occurrence of G^1 in Γ, that the valuations of the nodes of Γ and $\phi_t(G^1)$ are identical and that the domains and codomains of G^1 and G^2 match. Then $\Gamma[G^1 \coloneqq G^2]_t$ can be given a valuation, such that it agrees with the valuation of Γ on the nodes and edges included in $\Gamma - \phi_t(G^1)$, and it agrees with the valuation of $\phi_t(G^2)$ on the inner nodes and edges included in $\phi_t(G^2)$.*

PROOF. We admit that if $\gamma : [0,1] \to \Gamma$ is an edge and $t \in [0,1]$ is such that $\gamma(t)$ is not a singular point of $\gamma([0,1])$, then $\rho(\gamma) = \rho(\gamma_{|[0,t]}) + \rho(\gamma_{|[t,1]})$.

Up to a regular transformation, we can assume that the outer nodes of $\phi_t(G^1)$ are not singular nodes in Γ. Then, for every edge γ in Γ, there is a series of $t_0 < \cdots < t_k$ such that $t_0 = 0$, $t_k = 1$, and for $0 < i < k$, $\gamma(t_k)$ is an outer node of $\phi_t(G^1)$, and such that $\gamma((t_i, t_{i+1}))$ is either included in $\phi_t(G^1)$ or in $\Gamma - \phi_t(G^1)$.



Moreover, identifying temporarily v_1 and v_b with their second projection, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} &\rho(\gamma_{|[t_0,t_1]}) = v_b(\gamma(t_1)) - v_1(\gamma) \\ \text{for } 0 < i < k-1,\ &\rho(\gamma_{|[t_i,t_{i+1}]}) = v_b(\gamma(t_{i+1})) - v_b(\gamma(t_i)) \\ &\rho(\gamma_{|[t_{k-1},t_k]}) = v_1(\overline{\gamma}) - v_b(\gamma(t_{k-1})) \end{aligned}$$

Now for any edge γ in $\Gamma[G^1 := G^2]_t$, we have such a decomposition and $\rho(\gamma) = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \rho(\gamma_{|[t_i,t_{i+1}]})$. If $\gamma((0,t_1)) \subset \Gamma - \phi_t(G^2)$, we give γ the valuation of the edge in Γ starting on $\gamma(0)$ and whose image includes $\gamma((0,t_1))$. If $\gamma((0,t_1)) \subset \phi_t(G^2)$, then similarly we give γ the valuation from G^2. We can decompose the rotation number $\rho(\gamma)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(\gamma) &= \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \rho(\gamma_{|[t_i,t_{i+1}]}) \\ &= v_b(\gamma(t_1)) - v_1(\gamma) + \sum_{i=1}^{k-2} \big(v_b(\gamma(t_{i+1})) - v_b(\gamma(t_i))\big) + v_1(\overline{\gamma}) - v_b(\gamma(t_{k-1})) \\ &= v_1(\overline{\gamma}) - v_1(\gamma) \end{aligned}$$

Hence the condition (i) of the definition is satisfied. The two other conditions are directly inherited from Γ and G^2. ∎

6.8. THE CATEGORY OF VALUED GRAPHS Our autonomous category $L(\mathcal{C})$ will be defined as the category of $\mathcal{C}$-valued graphs. But to do so, we need to define an equivalence relation to account for some equalities of arrows from $\mathcal{C}$. This consists in defining reduction rules based on replacement.

We will need to define some particular $\mathcal{C}$-valued graphs. Instead of defining the graph and the valuations separately, we choose to draw them, replacing the black points representing our nodes by boxes containing the valuation of these nodes. The valuations of the edges are dropped when they are clear from the context.

For all $f \in \mathcal{C}(A_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes A_n, B_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes B_p)$ and $g \in \mathcal{C}(B_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes B_p, C_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes C_q)$ we define the following graphs:

$G_1(f,g) \coloneqq$



$G_1'(f,g) \coloneqq$



For all $f \in \mathcal{C}(A_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes A_p, B_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes B_q)$ and $g \in \mathcal{C}(C_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes C_n, D_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes D_m)$ we define the following graphs:

$G_2(f,g) \coloneqq$



$G_2'(f,g) \coloneqq$



For $A \in \mathcal{C}$ we define the following graphs:

$G_3(A) \coloneqq$



$G_3'(A) \coloneqq$



The generalized version of this last replacement pair (with multiple inputs and outputs) will be a consequence of the three replacement pairs, as it can be obtained as the n-fold product of identities.

6.9. Definition. *Let A and B be two $\mathcal{C}$-valued yankable graphs. We say that A reduces to B (denoted by $A \leq B$) when A contains the sub-graph $G = G_i(f, g)$ for some f and g arrows of $\mathcal{C}$ (or $G = G_3(X)$ for some $X \in \mathrm{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$), and B can be obtained by replacing this occurrence of G by $G' = G'_i(f, g)$ (or $G'_3(X)$, respectively).*

Another useful relation is $\Gamma \rightsquigarrow \Gamma'$, which holds when there is a deformation of graphs from Γ to Γ'. Finally we define the relation $\sim_{\mathcal{C}}$ as the reflexive, symmetric and transitive closure of $\leq \cup \rightsquigarrow$.

6.10. Definition. *The category $L(\mathcal{C})$ has:*

- *objects of the form $(A_1^{n_1}, \ldots, A_p^{n_p})$ where $A_i \in \mathrm{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$ and $n_i \in \mathbb{Z}$*
- *morphisms $f : A \to B$, where f is an equivalence class under $\sim_{\mathcal{C}}$ of $\mathcal{C}$-valued unit graphs with inputs A and outputs B.*

The composition and tensor product in $L(\mathcal{C})$ are defined as in [Joyal and Street, 1991]. Let $f \in L(\mathcal{C})(A, B)$ and $g \in L(\mathcal{C})(C, D)$ be $\mathcal{C}$-valued unit graphs. The morphism $f \otimes g \in L(\mathcal{C})(A \otimes_{L(\mathcal{C})} C, B \otimes_{L(\mathcal{C})} D)$ is defined by concatenating horizontally shrunken versions of f and g:

$$f \otimes g = \phi_{(0,\frac{1}{2},0,1)}(f) \cup \phi_{(\frac{1}{2},1,0,1)}(g).$$

Let $f \in L(\mathcal{C})(A, B)$ and $g \in L(\mathcal{C})(B, C)$ be $\mathcal{C}$-valued unit graphs, with $B = (B_1^{n_1}, \ldots, B_p^{n_p})$. We cannot simply stack the diagrams vertically to define the sequential composite $g \circ f$, because the horizontal positions $(u_1, \ldots, u_p)$ of the lower outer gates of f might not match with the positions $(v_1, \ldots, v_p)$ of the upper outer gates of g. Hence we add identity links between them:

$$f \circ g = \phi_{(0,1,0,\frac{1}{3})}(f) \cup \phi_{(0,1,\frac{1}{3},\frac{2}{3})}(L) \cup \phi_{(0,1,\frac{2}{3},1)}(g)$$

where L is the diagram with identity links between points $(u_i, 1)$ and $(v_i, 0)$ where u_i (respectively v_i) is the abscissa of the i-th lower outer gate of g (respectively upper outer gate of f).



This category is well defined because the composition is compatible with the relation $\sim_{\mathcal{C}}$. In other words, the equivalence class under $\sim_{\mathcal{C}}$ of the vertical stacking of two graphs does not depend on the choice of the two representatives. As it is also the case for the horizontal concatenation, $L(\mathcal{C})$ is also strict monoidal.

The product on objects is the concatenation of lists, the unit object is the empty list denoted by (), and the tensor product on arrows is the horizontal juxtaposition. Formally, this product is different from the tensor product of $\mathcal{C}$. But the rewrite rules defined above provide a bridge between the two. If there are objects $A, B, C, D \in \mathcal{C}$ such

that $A \otimes B = C \otimes D$, then the objects (A^0, B^0) and (C^0, D^0) are isomorphic in $L(\mathcal{C})$, with the following isomorphism:



6.11. Proposition. *For any monoidal category $\mathcal{C}$, $L(\mathcal{C})$ is autonomous.*

Proof. For any object $(A_1^{n_1}, \ldots, A_p^{n_p})$, let us show that it has a left adjoint $(A_p^{n_p-1}, \ldots, A_1^{n_p-1})$. A similar argument shows that it has a right adjoint $(A_p^{n_p+1}, \ldots, A_1^{n_p+1})$.
We define the following morphisms:

$$\epsilon : (A_p^{n_p-1}, \ldots, A_1^{n_1-1}, A_1^{n_1}, \ldots, A_p^{n_p}) \to () \qquad \eta : () \to (A_1^{n_1}, \ldots, A_p^{n_p}, A_p^{n_p-1}, \ldots, A_1^{n_1-1})$$

We emphasize that these graphs are valid $\mathcal{C}$-valued graphs and hence yankable: as they have no inner nodes, the condition of Definition 6.3 and the condition (ii) of Definition 6.6 are vacuously satisfied. They satisfy the yanking equalities (2), hence the category is autonomous. ∎

7. Freeness of $L(\mathcal{C})$ over $\mathcal{C}$

What remains to do is to show that $L(\mathcal{C})$ is the free autonomous category generated by $\mathcal{C}$. The first step is to show that $\mathcal{C}$ can be embedded functorialy in $L(\mathcal{C})$. Then, assuming that $\mathcal{C}$ is autonomous, we define the value of a $\mathcal{C}$-valued graph. Finally we show that these two constructions are adjoint, hence the freeness of $L(\mathcal{C})$.

7.1. Functorial embedding of the original category We define a strongly monoidal functorial embedding of $\mathcal{C}$ in $L(\mathcal{C})$.

7.2. Definition. *Let $F : \mathcal{C} \to L(\mathcal{C})$ be such that for all $A \in \mathrm{Ob}(\mathcal{C}), F(A) = (A^0)$ and*



As a consequence of the first rewrite rule of our relation $\leq$, F is a functor. Moreover, it is strongly monoidal, with the natural isomorphism $\mu_{A,B} : (A^0, B^0) \to (A \otimes B^0)$ and the isomorphism $\lambda : () \to (I^0)$. The coherence equations translate into the following equalities, which hold from the rewrite rules defined earlier:



7.3. Value of a valued graph Given a $\mathcal{C}$-valued graph, we cannot in general interpret this graph as an arrow of $\mathcal{C}$, because $\mathcal{C}$ is not always autonomous. But when $\mathcal{C}$ is autonomous, we can use the notion of **value** $v(\Gamma)$ of a valued graph Γ. We briefly recall its definition, taken from [Joyal and Street, 1988] and adapted to our terminology. We start with the definition of the value of a graph in the monoidal case. To do so, we restrict our graphs further by requiring that the edges are vertical, in the following sense.

7.4. Definition. *A **progressive graph** is a graph Γ such that for all edge γ, the projection on the second coordinate of γ is injective.*

As a consequence, the rotation numbers of edges are null in a progressive graph. To define the value of such a graph, we decompose it into simpler slices.

7.5. Definition. *A **prime graph** is a progressive graph with exactly one inner node, and such that every edge in the graph is connected to it.*

*An **invertible graph** is a progressive graph with no inner node.*

*An **elementary slice** is a progressive graph Γ that can be decomposed as $G_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes G_n$ where for each $1 \leq i \leq n$, G_i is prime or invertible.*



When these graphs are valued, we can give them a value $v(\Gamma)$. The value $v(\Gamma)$ of a prime graph Γ is the value of its unique inner node and the value of an invertible graph is the identity of its domain (which is equal to its codomain). Finally, we define the value of an elementary slice $\Gamma = G_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes G_n$ by $v(\Gamma) = v(G_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes v(G_n)$, which is independent of the decomposition.

Notice that any progressive graph Γ can be written as $\Gamma = G_1 \circ \cdots \circ G_p$ where G_i are elementary slices. To define the value of progressive graphs, we need the following lemma, whose proof is a direct consequence of Proposition 1.1 in [Joyal and Street, 1991].

7.6. Lemma. *Let Γ be a progressive graph. If $\Gamma = G_1 \circ \cdots \circ G_p = G'_1 \circ \cdots \circ G'_q$ where the G_i and G'_j are elementary slices, then $v(G_1) \circ \cdots \circ v(G_p) = v(G'_1) \circ \cdots \circ v(G'_q)$*

This defines the value of progressive graphs.

The value of general valued graphs is obtained by making the units and counits explicit in non progressive edges. More precisely, given a valued graph Γ and $\epsilon > 0$ we define the progressive graph Γ_ϵ by replacing each non progressive edge as follows. First, horizontal segments are eliminated, using the following replacements (and their upside-down counterparts):



Then, the singular points at turns are replaced by inner nodes with the appropriate valuation. Let γ be an edge and be x a singular point in γ such that both of its adjacent segments are above x. The case where they are both below is similar. Let $a < b \in [0, 1]$ be such that $[\gamma(a), x]$ and $[x, \gamma(b)]$ are strictly included in the adjacent segments of x. Finally let $(A, p) = v_1(\gamma)$ and $n = p + \rho(\gamma_{|[0,a]})$. As the category in which the graph is valued is autonomous, A has an $(n+1)$-fold right adjoint denoted by $A^{(n+1)}$, and there is an associated counit $\epsilon_{A^{(n+1)}} : A^{(n)} \otimes A^{(n+1)} \to I$. We replace x by an inner node valued by $\epsilon_{A^{(n+1)}}$. The case for the unit is symmetric.



Note that these transformations are different from the notion of replacement introduced earlier in Section 6.4. Here, we only show how to convert a valued graph into a progressive graph, but do not identify them using an equivalence relation as for the replacement pairs of Section 6.4.

It is shown in [Joyal and Street, 1988] that for ϵ small enough, $v(\Gamma_\epsilon)$ is independent of ϵ. We define $\tilde{v}(\Gamma) \coloneqq v(\Gamma_\epsilon)$ for such an ϵ. This defines the value of $\mathcal{C}$-valued graphs when $\mathcal{C}$ is autonomous. They also show in their Theorem 4 that this value is invariant under deformations of graphs. We state the following lemma for later use:

7.7. Lemma. *Let $f \in \mathrm{Mor}(L(\mathcal{C}))$ be a $\mathcal{C}$-valued graph, where $\mathcal{C}$ is autonomous. There is a $\mathcal{C}$-valued progressive graph g such that $\tilde{v}(f) = \tilde{v}(g)$. Moreover, when f has no horizontal segment, g can be obtained from f by replacing singular points by inner nodes.*

In order to make $\tilde{v}$ a strict monoidal functor, we need to prove the invariance of $\tilde{v}$ under replacement.

7.8. Lemma. *Let $f \in \mathrm{Mor}(L(\mathcal{C}))$ be a $\mathcal{C}$-valued graph, where $\mathcal{C}$ is autonomous. Let (G^1, G^2) be a replacement pair such that $\tilde{v}(G^1) = \tilde{v}(G^2)$. Let t be an occurrence of G^1 in f. Then $\tilde{v}(f[G^1 \coloneqq G^2]_t) = \tilde{v}(f)$.*

Proof. Let f be a valued unit graph, and $t = (a, b, c, d)$ be an occurrence of G^1 in f. As $\tilde{v}(f)$ is invariant under deformation of f, we can assume that f contains no horizontal segment. Up to another regular deformation, c and d are regular slices. Hence f can be decomposed into graphs f_1, f_2 and f_3 with boundaries respectively $(0, c)$, (c, d) and $(d, 1)$. We have $f = f_1 \circ f_2 \circ f_3$ and $f[G^1 \coloneqq G^2]_t = f_1 \circ f_2[G^1 \coloneqq G^2]_{t'} \circ f_3$, where $t' = (a, b, 0, 1)$. Similarly, f_2 can be decomposed in the vertical slices g_1, g_2 and g_3, with vertical boundaries respectively $(0, a)$, (a, b), $(b, 1)$. We have $f_2[G^1 \coloneqq G^2]_t = g_1 \otimes G^2 \otimes g_3$ hence $v(f_2[G^1 \coloneqq G^2]_t) = \tilde{v}(g_1) \otimes \tilde{v}(G^2) \otimes \tilde{v}(g_3)$ Finally, as $\tilde{v}(G^1) = \tilde{v}(G^2)$ and $v(f) = \tilde{v}(f_1) \circ \tilde{v}(f_2) \circ \tilde{v}(f_3)$, we have the required invariance. ∎

Hence, as $\tilde{v}$ is compatible with the two relations $\leq$ and $\rightsquigarrow$, it is compatible with $\sim_{\mathcal{C}}$. So $\tilde{v} : L(\mathcal{C}) \to \mathcal{C}$ is defined and is a strict monoidal functor.

7.9. A pair adjoint functors The objects introduced in our construction can be seen as part of an adjunction between a free and a forgetful functor. This will show that $L(\mathcal{C})$ has the required categorical properties to be called the free autonomous category generated by the monoidal category $\mathcal{C}$.

Let **Mon** be the category of strict monoidal categories and strong monoidal functors between them. We denote by **Nom** (as in auto*nom*ous) the category of autonomous

categories and strong monoidal functors between them.[2] Our construction L corresponds to a functor from **Mon** to **Nom**. To make L a functor, we need to define how it translates a strong monoidal functor $f : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$ to $L(f) : L\mathcal{C} \to L\mathcal{D}$. Let $\mu_{(A_1,\dots,A_n)} : f(A_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes A_n) \simeq f(A_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes f(A_n)$ be coherence isomorphism associated to f (with $\mu_{()} : f(I_\mathcal{C}) \simeq I_\mathcal{D}$). We define $L(f)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} L(f) : (A_1^{n_1}, \dots, A_p^{n_p}) &\mapsto (f(A_1)^{n_1}, \dots, f(A_p)^{n_p})) \\ (\Gamma, v_0, v_1) &\mapsto (\Gamma, v_0', f \circ v_1) \end{aligned}$$

We cannot simply define v_0' by $f \circ v_0$ as we have to compose with the coherence isomorphisms of f to ensure that the domain and codomain of the valuation match with the product of the valuation of the incoming and outgoing edges. Let x be a node and $(A_1, \dots, A_p)$ (respectively $(B_1, \dots, B_q)$) be the valuations of its input (respectively output) edges. We define

$$v_0'(x) = \mu_{(B_1,\dots,B_q)} \circ (f \circ v_0(x)) \circ \mu^{-1}_{(A_1,\dots,A_p)}$$

One can check that $(\Gamma, v_0', f \circ v_1)$ is indeed a $\mathcal{D}$-valued graph and that L is a strict monoidal functor.

We will show that this functor has a right adjoint $R : \mathbf{Nom} \to \mathbf{Mon}$, the inclusion functor. We define the unit for this adjunction by $\eta_\mathcal{C} \coloneqq F_\mathcal{C} : \mathcal{C} \to RL\mathcal{C}$ where F is the functorial embedding defined in Section 7.1.

The counit $\epsilon_\mathcal{C} : LR\mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}$ corresponds to the value functor introduced in section 7.3. It is defined on objects by $(A_1^{n_1}, \dots, A_p^{n_p}) \mapsto A_1^{(n_1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes A_p^{(n_p)}$. In other words, the formal product is sent to the actual product of the original category, and the formal adjoints are sent to the actual adjoints. An arrow f, that is to say a $\mathcal{C}$-valued graph, is sent to its value $v(f)$.

We now move on to the proof of the unit-counit equations, starting with $(R\epsilon) \circ (\eta R) = 1_R$. First, $\eta_{R(\mathcal{D})}$ takes an arrow in an autonomous category, seen as a monoidal category, and bundles it in a diagram. Then, $R\epsilon_\mathcal{D}$ evaluates this diagram in $\mathcal{D}$ (which is possible because $\mathcal{D}$ is actually autonomous), and the result is seen as an arrow in $R\mathcal{D}$.

$f \in \mathcal{C}(A, B) \quad \overset{\eta_{R(\mathcal{D})}}{\longmapsto}$  $\overset{R(\epsilon_\mathcal{D})}{\longmapsto} \quad f$

Hence the composition of the two is the identity. Let us show the remaining equality: $(\epsilon L) \circ (L\eta) = 1_L$.

[2] Recall that these functors automatically preserve adjoints.

$$(L\eta)_{\mathcal{C}} = L(\eta_{\mathcal{C}}) : L\mathcal{C} \to LRL\mathcal{C}$$
$$(A_1^{n_1}, \ldots, A_p^{n_p}) \mapsto ((A_1^0)^{n_1}, \ldots, (A_p^0)^{n_p})$$

The functor $L(\eta_{\mathcal{C}})$ applies $\eta_{\mathcal{C}}$ to the valuations of the graph, and the result is composed with the coherence morphisms so that the domains and codomains match with the incoming and outgoing edges. Graphically, this consists in adding inner boxes in each node, with morally the same inputs and outputs as the outer box it is contained in. Then, $\epsilon_{L(\mathcal{C})}$ evaluates the resulting graph in $L(\mathcal{C})$.

7.10. Theorem. *The following equality holds:* $(\epsilon L) \circ (L\eta) = 1_L$.

Proof. Let f be an arrow in $L\mathcal{C}$. Up to a deformation described in Section 7.3, we can assume that it has no horizontal segment. As $RL\mathcal{C}$ is autonomous, we can apply Lemma 7.7 to $L\eta_{\mathcal{C}}(f) \in \mathrm{Mor}(LRL\mathcal{C})$: $\tilde{v}(L\eta_{\mathcal{C}}(f)) = \tilde{v}(g)$ where g is progressive and is obtained from $L\eta_{\mathcal{C}}(f)$ by replacing singular points by inner nodes. But $L\eta_{\mathcal{C}}(f)$ differs only from f by the valuations: the underlying graph is the same. Hence the decomposition of g into prime and invertible factors given by Lemma 7.6 induces a decomposition of f, where the factors are not necessarily prime or invertible however.

We prove that $\tilde{v}(g) = f$ by induction on the number of factors in the decomposition of g. If g is prime, let x be its unique inner node. There are two cases. If x is also an inner node in f, then g is indeed mapped to itself, as shown in Figure 1. Otherwise, x corresponds to a singular point in f and is labelled by a unit or a counit, and is mapped to itself as shown in Figure 2. If g is invertible, it is mapped to itself as well.

Now for the general case, suppose that $g = g_1 \circ g_2$ where g_1 and g_2 can be decomposed in a smaller number of factors (the case $g_1 \otimes g_2$ is analogous). As noted earlier, this induces a decomposition $L\eta_{\mathcal{C}}(f) = h_1 \circ h_2$ such that g_i is the progressive version of h_i. This induces in turn a decomposition $f = f_1 \circ f_2$ such that $h_i = L\eta_{\mathcal{C}}(f_i)$. By induction, $\tilde{v}(g_i) = f_i$. As $\tilde{v}$ is a strict monoidal functor, we get $\tilde{v}(g) = f$. ∎

The notion of adjunction helps us to relate our construction with that of [Preller and Lambek, 2007] who describe the free autonomous category generated by a category. Let $L' : \mathbf{Cat} \to \mathbf{Mon}$ be the free monoidal category functor, and $R' : \mathbf{Mon} \to \mathbf{Cat}$ be the corresponding forgetful functor. By composition of the adjunctions, $L \circ L'$ is left adjoint to $R' \circ R$.



The construction of Preller and Lambek corresponds to a free functor from **Cat** to **Nom**, which is equivalent to $L \circ L'$ by uniqueness of the adjoint. Hence we just gave a factorization of their free functor.



Figure 1: Equality in the case of a prime diagram



Figure 2: Equality in the case of a counit

8. Future work

A very useful result would be an equivalent of the normalization property of [Preller and Lambek, 2007] for our free construction, as follows:

8.1. Conjecture. *Let* $f : (A_1^{n_1}, \ldots, A_p^{n_p}) \to (B_1^{m_1}, \ldots, B_q^{m_q})$ *be an arrow in* $L(\mathcal{C})$. *If* $n_i = m_j = 0$ *for all* i *and* j, *then there is* $g \in \mathcal{C}$ *such that* f *is equal to*



It would also be interesting to see if a similar approach could be used to define the free compact closed category generated by a monoidal category. In fact, it seems that in general, the free autonomous category generated by a symmetric monoidal category is not compact closed. In other words, a symmetry for plain objects does not generate a symmetry for their adjoints.

From a linguistic perspective, this result motivates experiments with novel semantic models, as any monoidal category can be used to represent the meaning of sentences. It also recasts some previous approaches in a categorical description. Of course, the only fact that these frameworks can be described with category theory will not make them any better for experimental purposes. However, this suggests the development of general purpose tools that can be instantiated for various models, retaining only the logic of autonomous categories.

9. Acknowledgements

The author wishes to thank Amar Hadzihasanovic, Paul-André Melliès, Andrew Pitts and Anne Preller for their valuable feedback on this project. This work has been supported by the École Normale Supérieure.

References

Samson Abramsky and Bob Coecke, A categorical semantics of quantum protocols. In *LICS Proceedings*, pages 415–425. IEEE Computer Society, 2004.

Stephen Clark. Type-driven syntax and semantics for composing meaning vectors. In Chris Heunen, Mehrnoosh Sadrzadeh, and Edward Grefenstette, editors, *Quantum Physics and Linguistics*, pages 359–377. Oxford University Press, 2013.

Stephen Clark, Bob Coecke, and Mehrnoosh Sadrzadeh. A compositional distributional model of meaning. In *Proceedings of the Second Quantum Interaction Symposium (QI-2008)*, pages 133–140, 2008.

Stephen Clark and Stephen Pulman. Combining symbolic and distributional models of meaning. In *AAAI Spring Symposium: Quantum Interaction*, pages 52–55, 2007.

Bob Coecke. Quantum picturalism. *Contemporary Physics*, 51:59–83, 2009. arXiv:0908.1787.

Bob Coecke, Edward Grefenstette, and Mehrnoosh Sadrzadeh. Lambek vs. Lambek: Functorial vector space semantics and string diagrams for Lambek calculus. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 164(11):1079–1100, 2013.

Bob Coecke, Mehrnoosh Sadrzadeh, and Stephen Clark. Mathematical foundations for a compositional distributional model of meaning. *Linguistic Analysis*, 36(1-4):345–384, 2011.

George Cybenko. Approximation by superpositions of a sigmoidal function. *Mathematics of control, signals and systems*, 2(4):303–314, 1989.

Antonin Delpeuch and Anne Preller. From natural language to RDF graphs with pregroups. In *Proceedings of the EACL 2014 Workshop on Type Theory and Natural Language Semantics (TTNLS)*, pages 55–62, Gothenburg, Sweden, April 2014. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Edward Grefenstette and Mehrnoosh Sadrzadeh. Experimental support for a categorical compositional distributional model of meaning. In *EMNLP*, pages 1394–1404, 2011.

Edward Grefenstette, Mehrnoosh Sadrzadeh, Stephen Clark, Bob Coecke, and Stephen Pulman. Concrete sentence spaces for compositional distributional models of meaning. In *Computing Meaning*, pages 71–86. Springer, 2014.

Kurt Hornik. Approximation capabilities of multilayer feedforward networks. *Neural networks*, 4(2):251–257, 1991.

André Joyal and Ross Street. Planar diagrams and tensor algebra. Unpublished manuscript, available from Ross Street's website, URL: `http://maths.mq.edu.au/~street/PlanarDiags.pdf`. Sept. 1988.

André Joyal and Ross Street. The geometry of tensor calculus, I. *Advances in Mathematics*, 88(1):55–112, 1991.

André Joyal and Ross Street. Braided tensor categories. *Advances in Mathematics*, 102(1):20–78, 1993.

Dimitri Kartsaklis and Mehrnoosh Sadrzadeh. A study of entanglement in a categorical framework of natural language. In *Proceedings of the 11th Workshop on Quantum Physics and Logic (QPL)*, Kyoto, Japan, June 2014. To appear.

Jayant Krishnamurthy and Tom M Mitchell. Vector space semantic parsing: A framework for compositional vector space models. *ACL 2013*, page 1, 2013.

Saunders Mac Lane. *Categories for the working mathematician*, volume 5. Springer, 1998.

Tomas Mikolov, Ilya Sutskever, Kai Chen, Greg S Corrado, and Jeff Dean. Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 3111–3119, 2013.

Tamara Polajnar, Luana Fagarasan, and Stephen Clark. Reducing dimensions of tensors in type-driven distributional semantics. Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP), pages 1036–1046. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2014.

Anne Preller. Category theoretical semantics for pregroup grammars. In *Logical aspects of computational linguistics*, pages 238–254. Springer, 2005.

Anne Preller. From Sentence to Concept. In Chris Heunen, Mehrnoosh Sadrzadeh, and Edward Grefenstette, editors, *Quantum Physics and Linguistics*, pages 252–281. Oxford University Press, 2013.

Anne Preller and Joachim Lambek. Free compact 2-categories. *Mathematical. Structures in Comp. Sci.*, 17(2):309–340, April 2007.

Mehrnoosh Sadrzadeh, Stephen Clark, and Bob Coecke. The Frobenius anatomy of word meanings II: possessive relative pronouns. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 2014.

Peter Selinger. A survey of graphical languages for monoidal categories. In *New Structures for Physics*, volume 813 of *Lecture Notes in Physics*, pages 289–233. Springer, 2011.

École Normale Supérieure
45 rue d'Ulm
75005 Paris

University of Cambridge
Trinity College
Trinity Street
CB2 1TQ Cambridge, UK

Email: `antonin@delpeuch.eu`